



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,250	07/31/2003	Charles Hymes	47524/P157/10613152	4797
29053	7590	06/25/2008	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P			AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS	
2200 ROSS AVENUE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 2800			2179	
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/633,250	Applicant(s) HYMES ET AL.
	Examiner NICHOLAS AUGUSTINE	Art Unit 2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

A. This action is in response to the following communications: Amendment filed: 3/12/2008. This action is made **Final**.

B. Claims 1-29 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Subramaniam (US 2007/0118504 A1), herein referred to as "Subramaniam" in view of Bartz et al (US 7,080,327 B1), herein referred to as "Bartz".

As for independent claim 1, Subramaniam teaches a graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center, comprising: a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (figure 26, main interface for the agent at the call center); at least one icon corresponding to at least one managed application applications (figure 26, icon tabs located at the top of the interface which provide differing workflow applications "service", "activities", "category", etc; as well as figure 4 which shows a search icon to perform a search function; par.71); and a managed application display area the at least one managed application corresponding to the at least one icon (figure 26, activity plans is being shown 2600 from the control "Service-> My Service Request -> Activity Plans), wherein the at least one icon is selected according to a step of an automated workflow that guides the agent's handling of a contact (par.82 and figure 26; wherein depicted are various elements in a workflow guideline help an agent handle a customer; "executing workflow and process automation"), and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (par.72-73 and 82).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is

interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 2, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a separate window (figure 26, in the toolbar; the toolbar as depicted is a separate entity of the graphical user interface).

As for dependent claim 3, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a quick start bar. Subramaniam does not specifically teach wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed application, however Bartz does (figure 4A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 4, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a contact center control panel presenting current contact information (par.9; figure 19).

As for dependent claim 5, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1. Subramaniam does not in great detail explain how the graphical user interface allows an agent to selectively input data into the at least one managed application displayed in the managed application display area, however Bartz does (col.8, lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 6, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 5. Subramaniam does not in great detail explain more than one managed application is displayed concurrently in the managed application display area , however Bartz does (col.8, lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 7, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein when the agent selects any of the one or more icons, the

corresponding managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display/area (figure 26).

As for independent claim 8, Subramaniam teaches a method of managing a visual space of a customer relations management application, the method comprising:

- a. displaying a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (figure 26, main interface for the agent at the call center);
- b. displaying at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications (figure 26); and
- c. displaying an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the handling of a customer call, the automated workflow having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow (par.82 and figure 26;wherein depicted are the essential control applications to handle an automated workflow), and wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow (par.72-73 and 82).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the

most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 9, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further wherein the managed application identified by the selected icon is displayed in a separate window (figure 26; various panes are depicted).

As for dependent claim 10, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim . Subramaniam does not in great detail explain further comprising displaying a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes one or more icons for identifying non-managed application, however Bartz does (figure 4A). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam; this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 11, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising displaying a contact center control panel presenting current contact information (figure 19, 26).

As for dependent claim 12, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selectively inputting data into any one of the least one managed

applications (figure 27).

As for dependent claim 13, Subramaniam teaches the method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selecting any of the at least one icon thereby displaying the corresponding managed application in the managed application display area (figure 26; note the analysis of claim 7).

As for independent claim 14, Subramaniam teaches in a system having a central processor, a display, a memory and an input device, a graphical user interface for displaying an agent desktop in a contact center, comprising:

- a. a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application;
- b. at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications (figure 26, toolbar located at the top of the interface containing various applications "Service", "Activities", etc each part of an automated workflow process containing unique individual forms and information to the agent); and
- c. an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow (par.82), and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the

at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step_ of the automated workflow (par.72-73 and 82).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result

with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 15, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed outside of the managed application display area (figure 26; note the analysis of claim 9).

As for dependent claim 16, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application (figure 26; note the analysis of claim 10).

As for dependent claim 17, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a contact center control panel presenting current contact information (figure 25-27).

As for dependent claim 18, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 wherein the graphical user interface is displayed on the agent desktop having a display and an input device (figure 1-2, par.77).

As for dependent claim 19, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 18 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data into any one of the at least one managed applications (par.77, as well commonly known in the art interaction of a user interface makes use of input devices as depicted in figure 2 "user interface" presence).

As for dependent claim 20, Subramaniam teaches the system as claimed in claim 14 wherein when the agent selects any of the at least one icon the corresponding managed application is displayed in the managed application display area (figure 26-27; note the analysis of claim 7).

As for independent claim 21, Subramaniam teaches a graphical user interface for displaying on an desktop in a contact center, comprising: a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application (figure 4,26); a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information, wherein the information indicates a type of call panel by the current contact to the contact center (fig.26,27 par.9); a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (fig.26); at least one icon corresponding to each one of

the at least one managed applications (fig.26); a managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility & the at least one managed application in the managed application display area (par.72-73); and an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of the current contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and the type of call indicated by the contact center control panel! (par.82, fig.26 (various application programs par.72)), and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area, further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is selectively displayed outside of the managed display area (fig.26).

Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele; Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected

task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 22, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 21 wherein the agent desktop has a display and an input device (fig.1-2, par.77).

As for dependent claim 23, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 22 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data into any one of the least one managed applications (par.77; it is well commonly known that

interaction with a user interface has common input device such as mouse and/or keyboard among others (fig.1-2)).

As for dependent claim 24, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23 wherein when the agent selects any of the at least one icon the corresponding managed application is displayed in the managed application display area (fig.26; note the analysis of claim 7).

As for dependent claim 25, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23, wherein the type of call is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat (par.8, 9 and 14).

As for independent claim 26, Subramaniam teaches a method for managing a graphical user interface of an agent's desktop in a contact center, the method comprising: receiving a call at the contact center, the call having one of a plurality of media types; automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type; and automatically re-configuring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of a pre-programmed call handling workflow (par.8, 9, 14, 82 and fig.1-2). Subramaniam provides the basic implementation of a call center running multiple applications to provide various e-business solutions provide to their clientele;

Subramaniam does not expressly go into great detail to explain how the interface is interacted with by the user and the figures (although a picture is worth a thousand words) do not provide enough detail as well, however in the same field of endeavor (workflow graphical user interfaces) Bartz does. Bartz teaches a task bar, wherein the task bar includes one or more icons for identifying managed applications; a managed application display area that displays a managed application responsive to the icon identifying the managed application being selected wherein the icon is selected according to a step in an automated workflow that guides the user through a selected task to perform and wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the icon is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (col.2, lines 43-46, 59-66; col.4, lines 44-47; col.7, lines 57-67; col.8, lines 1-48; figure 4A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35). The end result with the combination of Subramaniam as modified with Bartz is a graphical user interface presenting workflow automation to provide guided view to the user to accomplish desired task and dynamic scripting to ensure that work is handled in the most efficient proper manner and that business processes and policies are always enforced (Subramaniam; par.15 and Bartz; col.2, lines 33-35 and 43-46).

As for dependent claim 27, Subramaniam teaches the method of claim 26.

Subramaniam does not expressly go into detail about wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically re-sizing one or more applications, at least in part, as a function of a number of simultaneously open applications, however Bartz does (col.8, lines 35-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Bartz into Subramaniam, this is true because Bartz suggest a method to solving a problem of helping a user to guide through a series of task in an orderly manner while facilitating movement between tasks (col.2, lines 33-35).

As for dependent claim 28, Subramaniam teaches the method of claim 27, wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically closing one or more applications as the agent follows the steps of the pre-programmed call handling workflow (par.8, 15 and 82).

As for dependent claim 29, Subramaniam teaches the graphical user interface as claimed in claim 26, wherein the one of the plurality of media types is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat (par.8, 9 and 14).

(Note:) It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Augustine whose telephone number is 571-270-1056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday: 7:30- 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on 571-272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas Augustine/
Examiner
Art Unit 2179
June 19, 2008

/Ba Huynh/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2179